UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

August 18, 1997

Mr. Joseph Joyce
BRAC Environmental Coordinator
AC/S Environment (1AU)
MCAS EL Toro
P. O. Box 95001
Santa Ana, CA 92709-5001

Re: EPA Review of Draft Final Groundwater Remediation Pilot Test Work Plan, Marine Corps Air Station El Toro, CA

Dear Mr. Joyce:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has reviewed the document referenced above. There remains one comment from EPA's comments on the Draft Pilot Test Wok Plan that has not been sufficiently addressed and is attached to this letter.

Please call me at (415) 744-2210 or Herb Levine at (415) 744-2312, if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Glenn R. Kistner

Glenn R. Kistner
Remedial Project Manager
Federal Facilities Cleanup Branch

Attachment

cc: Tayseer Mahmoud, DTSC
Larry Vitale, RWQCB
Andy Piszkin, SWDIV
Pat Brooks, Bechtel

MEMORANDUM

Date: August 18, 1997

SUBJECT: Review of Draft Final Groundwater Remediation Pilot Test Work Plan
MCAS El Toro

TO: Glenn Kisnter, RPM
Navy Section

FROM: Herbert Levine, Hydrogeologist
Technical Support Team

One comment made previously to the Draft version of this document has not been adequately addressed in the Draft Final. That is regarding the pathway between the shallow and principle aquifers. During previous discussions with the Navy regarding this comment to the Draft document we were informed that it was omitted due to an oversight and would be added to the Draft Final. This has been added to the Draft Final in the discussion of DQOs. However that discussion is incomplete. The fourth DQO step, to define the study boundary is not complete to answer this question since the location where the pathway occurs is restricted to Figure 1.2. The fifth DQO, to develop a decision rule is also not complete since , for this problem item 1 only states that CPT and HydroPunch data will be used. There should be more detail as to how that data will be used and how the decision to step out or expand the boundary will be made. It would be helpful to add the evaluation of this pathway to the flow chart of Figure 1-3.

The other comments made to the Draft document have been adequately addressed in the Draft Final.